



RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

AUG 25 2006

4845 Pearl East Circle

Suite 300

Boulder, CO 80301

(720) 931-3000, Fax (720) 931-3001

[www.lathropgage.com](http://www.lathropgage.com)

Direct Dial Number:  
(720) 931-3011

2345 Grand Boulevard,  
Suite 2800  
Kansas City, MO 64108-2612  
(816) 292-2000, Fax (816) 292-2001

230 Park Avenue  
Suite 1847  
New York, NY 10169  
(212) 850-6220, Fax (212) 850-6221

314 East High Street  
Jefferson City, MO 65101  
(573) 893-4336, Fax (573) 893-5398

10851 Mastin Blvd.  
Building 82, Suite 1000  
Overland Park, KS 66210-1669  
(913) 451-5100, Fax (913) 451-0875

1845 S. National  
Springfield, MO 65808-4288  
(417) 886-2000, Fax (417) 886-9126

1010 Market Street  
Suite 1300  
St. Louis, MO 63101-2000  
(314) 613-2500, Fax (314) 613-2550

1200 G Street, N.W.  
Suite 800  
Washington, D.C. 20005  
(202) 434-8984, Fax (202) 434-8992

August 25, 2006

From: Curtis A. Vock

Matter No.: 408392

To:	Company:	Fax Number:	Phone Number:
Mail Stop Appeal Brief -- Patents Attn: Examiner Nasser	U.S. Patent Office	(571) 273-8300	

Number of Pages Transmitted (including this cover sheet): 39

Message:

U.S. Patent Serial No.: 10/633,943

Filed: August 4, 2003

Entitled: Information-Bearing Pavement Tape

Attorney Docket No.: 408392

If you have a problem receiving this facsimile, please call: (720) 931-3000


Fax Attendant: Karen

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTE:

The information in this facsimile message ("fax") is sent by an attorney or his/her agent, is intended to be confidential and for the use of only the individual or entity named above. The information may be protected by attorney/client privilege, work product immunity or other legal rules. If the reader of this message is not the intended recipient, you are notified that retention, dissemination, distribution or copying of this fax is strictly prohibited. If you receive this fax in error, please notify us immediately by telephone and return it to the address above. Thank you.

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

AUG 25 2006

<b>CERTIFICATE OF FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION 37 CFR 1.8</b>				Matter No.
Applicant(s): Gregory W. Gorman				408392
Serial No.	Filing Date	Examiner	Group Art Unit	
10/633,943	August 4, 2003	Ahmad Nasser	1772	
Invention	Information-Bearing Pavement Tape			
<p>I hereby certify that the following: Facsimile Cover Sheet (1 pag); Transmittal Form (1 page) Appeal Brief (34 pages); Fee Transmittal For FY 2006 (1 page in duplicate); authorization to charge Deposit Account No. 12-0600 in the amount of \$250.00 for the Appeal Brief; authorization to charge additional fees that may be required, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 12-0600 are being sent via facsimile transmission to Mail Stop Appeal Brief - Patents, c/o the Commission For Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on this 25th day of August, 2006</p>				
<p><u>Karen Jodzio-Head</u> Name of Transmitter</p>				
 Signature of Transmitter				
<p>(571) 273-8300 Facsimile No.</p>				

PTO/SB/21 (00-04)

Approved for use through 07/31/2008, OMB 0651-0031  
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office; U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
Under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number.

<b>TRANSMITTAL FORM</b>		Application Number	10/633,943
		Filing Date	August 4, 2003
		First Named Inventor	Gregory W. Gorman
		Art Unit	1772
(to be used for all correspondence after initial filing)		Examiner Name	Ahmad Nasser
Total Number of Pages in This Submission		Attorney Docket Number	408392

*RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER  
AUG 25 2008*

<b>ENCLOSURES (check all that apply)</b>			
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Fee Transmittal Form <input type="checkbox"/> Fee Attached <input type="checkbox"/> Amendment / Reply <input type="checkbox"/> After Final <input type="checkbox"/> Affidavits/declaration(s) <input type="checkbox"/> Extension of Time Request <input type="checkbox"/> Express Abandonment Request <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement <input type="checkbox"/> Certified Copy of Priority Document(s) <input type="checkbox"/> Reply to Missing Parts/ Incomplete Application <input type="checkbox"/> Reply to Missing Parts under 37 CFR 1.52 or 1.53	<input type="checkbox"/> Drawing(s) <input type="checkbox"/> Licensing-related Papers <input type="checkbox"/> Petition <input type="checkbox"/> Petition to Convert to a Provisional Application <input type="checkbox"/> Power of Attorney, Revocation Change of Correspondence Address <input type="checkbox"/> Terminal Disclaimer <input type="checkbox"/> Request for Refund <input type="checkbox"/> CD, Number of CD(s) _____ <input type="checkbox"/> Landscape Table on CD	<input type="checkbox"/> After Allowance Communication to TC <input type="checkbox"/> Appeal Communication to Board of Appeals and Interferences <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Appeal Communication to TC (Appeal Notice, Brief, Reply Brief) <input type="checkbox"/> Proprietary Information <input type="checkbox"/> Status Letter <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other Enclosure(s) (please identify below): Certificate of Facsimile Facsimile Cover Sheet	
		<b>Remarks</b>	

<b>SIGNATURE OF APPLICANT, ATTORNEY, OR AGENT</b>			
Firm	LATHROP & GAGE LC		
Signature			
Printed Name	Curtis A. Vack		
Date	August 25, 2006	Reg. No.	38,356

**CERTIFICATE OF TRANSMISSION/MAILING**

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the USPTO or deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on the date shown below.

Signature	
Typed or printed name	Karen Jodzio-Head
Date	August 25, 2006

This collection of information is required by 37 CFR 1.5. The information is required to obtain or retain a benefit by the public which is to file (and by the USPTO to process) an application. Confidentiality is governed by 35 U.S.C. 122 and 37 CFR 1.11 and 1.14. This collection is estimated to 12 minutes to complete, including gathering, preparing, and submitting the completed application form to the USPTO. Time will vary depending upon the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you require to complete this form and/or suggestions for reducing this burden, should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, U.S. Department of Commerce, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. SEND TO: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

*If you need assistance in completing the form, call 1-800-PTO-9199 and select option 2.*

Fees pursuant to the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2005 (H.R. 4818).

## FEE TRANSMITTAL for FY 2006

Applicant claims small entity status. See 37 CFR 1.27

TOTAL AMOUNT OF PAYMENT

(\$ 250.00)

Complete If Known

Application Number	10/633,943	<b>RECEIVED</b> <b>CENTRAL FAX CENTER</b> <b>AUG 25 2006</b>
Filing Date	August 4, 2003	
First Named Inventor	Gregory Winfield Gorman	
Examiner Name	Nasser Ahmad	

Examiner Name

Art Unit

Attorney Docket No.

## METHOD OF PAYMENT (check all that apply)

Check  Credit Card  Money Order  Nonc  Other (please identify) : \_\_\_\_\_

Deposit Account Deposit Account Number: 12-0600 Deposit Account Name: Lathrop & Gage LC

For the above-identified deposit account, the Director is hereby authorized to: (check all that apply)

Charge fee(s) indicated below  Charge fee(s) indicated below, except for the filing fee

Charge any additional fee(s) or underpayments of fee(s)  Credit any overpayments

Under 37 CFR 1.16 and 1.17

WARNING: Information on this form may become public. Credit card information should not be included on this form. Provide credit card information and authorization on PTO-2038.

## FEE CALCULATION

## 1. BASIC FILING, SEARCH, AND EXAMINATION FEES

Application Type	FILING FEES		SEARCH FEES		EXAMINATION FEES		Fees Paid (\$)
	Small Entity	Fee (\$)	Small Entity	Fee (\$)	Small Entity	Fee (\$)	
Utility	300	150	500	250	200	100	_____
Design	200	100	100	50	130	65	_____
Plant	200	100	300	150	160	80	_____
Reissue	300	150	500	250	600	300	_____
Provisional	200	100	0	0	0	0	_____

## 2. EXCESS CLAIM FEES

## Fee Description

Each claim over 20 (including Reissues)

Each independent claim over 3 (including Reissues)

Multiple dependent claims

Total Claims	Extra Claims	Fee (\$)	Fee Paid (\$)	Small Entity	
				Fee (\$)	Fee (\$)
-20 or HP=	x	=	_____	50	25
HP = highest number of total claims paid for, if greater than 20.				200	100
Indep. Claims	Extra Claims	Fee (\$)	Fee Paid (\$)	360	180
- 3 or HP=	x	=	_____	Multiple Dependent Claims	
HP = highest number of independent claims paid for, if greater than 3.				Fee (\$)	Fee Paid (\$)

## 3. APPLICATION SIZE FEE

If the specification and drawings exceed 100 sheets of paper (excluding electronically filed sequence or computer listings under 37 CFR 1.52(e)), the application size fee due is \$250 (\$125 for small entity) for each additional 50 sheets or fraction thereof. See 35 U.S.C. 41(a)(1)(G) and 37 CFR 1.16(s).

Total Sheets	Extra Sheets	Number of each additional 50 or fraction thereof	Fee (\$)	Fee Paid (\$)
- 100 =	/ 50 =	(round up to a whole number) x	=	_____

## 4. OTHER FEE(S)


Non-English Specification, \$130 fee (no small entity discount)

Other (e.g., late filing surcharge) : Appeal Brief

Fee Paid (\$)

\$250

## SUBMITTED BY

Signature		Registration No. (Attorney/Agent)	38,355	Telephone	(703) 831-3011
Name (Print/Type)	Curtis A. Vock			Date	August 26, 2006

This collection of information is required by 37 CFR 1.136. The information is required to obtain or retain a benefit by the public which is to file (and by the USPTO to process) an application. Confidentiality is governed by 35 U.S.C. 122 and 37 CFR 1.14. This collection is estimated to take 30 minutes to complete, including gathering, preparing, and submitting the completed application form to the USPTO. Time will vary depending upon the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you require to complete this form and/or suggestions for reducing this burden, should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, U.S. Department of Commerce, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. SEND TO: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

If you need assistance in completing this form, call 1-800-PTO-0109 (1-800-767-0109) and select option 2.

**PATENT**  
Attorney Docket: 408392

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

Applicant(s): Gregory Winfield Gorman

Group Art No.: 1772

Serial No.: 10/633,943

Examiner: Nasser Ahmad

Filed: 04 August 2003

Confirmation No.: 5211

For: INFORMATION-BEARING PAVEMENT  
TAPE

**RECEIVED**  
**CENTRAL FAX CENTER**  
**AUG 25 2006**

**Mail Stop Appeal Brief – Patents**  
**Commissioner for Patents**  
**P.O. Box 1450**  
**Alexandria, VA 22313-1450**

**APPEAL BRIEF**

Dear Sir:

In accord with 37 C.F.R. §41.37, and fully responsive to the final office action of August 2, 2006, Appellants hereby file their appeal brief in support of their Appeal in the above-identified matter (hereinafter, the "943 Application"). A notice of appeal was submitted on August 17, 2006, with authorization to charge the requisite fees to Deposit Account No. 12-0600. As this appeal brief is filed within two months of the notice of appeal, it is considered timely filed under 37 C.F.R. §41.37. Authorization to charge the \$250 fee for filing this appeal brief to the aforementioned Deposit Account is submitted herewith, as required by 37 C.F.R. §41.20(b)(2).

08/28/2006 TL0111 00000008 120600 10633943  
01 FC:2402 250.00 DA

1 of 34

**APPEAL BRIEF**

Submitted in Response to the Final Office Action Dated 08/02/2006 in U.S. Serial No. 10/633,943

*Attorney Docket: 408392***TABLE OF CONTENTS**

<b>Real party in interest.....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Related appeals and interferences.....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Status of claims.....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Status of amendments.....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Summary of claimed subject matter .....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>Grounds for rejection to be reviewed on appeal.....</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Argument.....</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>General Discussion.....</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Argument (A) .....</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>Argument (B).....</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>Argument (C) .....</b>	<b>27</b>
<b>Reference to Claims Appendix .....</b>	<b>28</b>
<b>Reference to Evidence Appendix.....</b>	<b>28</b>
<b>Reference to Related Proceedings Appendix.....</b>	<b>28</b>
<b>Conclusions.....</b>	<b>29</b>
<b>CLAIMS APPENDIX TO APPEAL BRIEF.....</b>	<b>30</b>
<b>EVIDENCE APPENDIX TO APPEAL BRIEF.....</b>	<b>33</b>
<b>RELATED PROCEEDINGS APPENDIX TO APPEAL BRIEF .....</b>	<b>34</b>

*Atty. Docket No. 408392*

**(1) Real party in interest.**

The real party in interest is Gregory Winfield Gorman, the sole inventor of this '943 application, residing at 473 Wyoming Circle, Golden, Colorado, 80403, U.S.A.

**(2) Related appeals and interferences.**

No other appeals or interferences are currently known to Appellants that will directly affect, be directly affected by, or have a bearing on the decision to be rendered by the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences in the present appeal.

**(3) Status of claims.**

Claims 1-11 and 28-34 are pending in this application, with claims 1, 9, 10 and 28 being independent. Claims 1-8, 11 and 28-34 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112 as failing to comply with the written description requirement. Claims 1-5, 7-8, 11, 28-32 and 34 also stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(c) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,514,655 ("Bastiaens"). Claims 6 and 33 also stand rejected under U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bastiaens. Claims 9 and 10 are allowed. Applicant appeals all claims 1-8, 11 and 28-34.

**(4) Status of amendments.**

The '943 Application was filed on August 4, 2003, with claims 1-27. A first office action was mailed January 24, 2005, restricting the claims and requiring election of one claim group. A response to the restriction requirement was filed and entered February 18, 2005, electing claims 1-19 and cancelling claims 20-27. A second office action was mailed March 14, 2005, to which a response was filed and entered May 24, 2005, including amendments to the drawings (FIG. 5), specification (p. 8, ¶[0058]) and claims (1, 10 and 12), and adding new claims 28-35. A final office action was mailed August 9, 2005, to which a response was filed and entered October 7, 2005. The response of October 7, 2005 included amendments to claims 1, 11, 12 and 19, and noted improper finality of the office action of August 9, 2005. Accordingly, a non-final office action was mailed October 24, 2005, to which a response was filed and entered February 24, 2006,

*Attorney Docket: 408392*

including amendments to claims 1, 9, 10 and 28. A final office action was mailed May 17, 2006, rejecting claims 1-8, 11 and 28-34. A response to final office action was filed July 17, 2006, including an amendment to claim 1 (changing the spelling of one word), cancelling claims 12-19 and 35 and including an amendment to the specification. This amendment was denied entry on July 17, 2006. An advisory action was mailed August 2, 2006, indicating the denial of entry. The notice of appeal filed herein is responsive to the advisory action of August 2, 2006 and the final office action of May 17, 2006. Claims 1-11 and 28-34 are currently pending, of which claims 2-8 are original (without claim amendment during prosecution).

**(5) Summary of claimed subject matter.**

The inventions of claims 1-8 and 11 relate to a pavement tape for conveying information when affixed to pavement (e.g., pavement tape 100, FIGs. 1-3a and pavement 110, FIG. 6; Specification p. 3 ¶¶[0010]-[0013]). The pavement tape includes a continuous elongated flexible tape body (e.g., tape body 101, FIGs. 1-3A) of homogenous composition (e.g., FIGs. 5-13; Specification p. 5, ¶ [0044]). The tape body is configured for affixing to pavement (e.g., FIGs. 7-9, 11, 17, 21 and 22; Specification p. 3, ¶¶ [0010]-[0011]). The tape body has a front face and a continuously flat rear face (e.g., Specification p. 3, ¶[0011]; front face 10 and rear face 12, FIG. 5, amended on 5/24/2005; and Specification p. 8, ¶[0058], also amended 5/24/2005). At least one symbol (e.g., symbol 102, FIG. 1) printed on the front face conveys information. The front and rear faces are exposed at an end of the continuous elongated flexible tape body (see, e.g., end view FIGs. 5, 6 and 15; FIGs. 2 and 7; Specification p. 3, ¶[0015]; p. 4, ¶[0020]-[0021]; pp. 8-9, ¶[0059]-¶[0063]).

Claims 2-8 and 11 additionally relates to a pavement tape with an adhesive on the rear face, for bonding the pavement tape to the pavement (e.g., tape 101 with adhesive 112; FIGs. 12-13). One face of a flexible release tape (e.g., release tape 114; FIGs. 12-13) is releasably bonded to the adhesive. A flexible protective tape (e.g., protective tape 108; FIGs. 9-13) is releasably bonded at one face to the front face of the pavement tape. The at least one symbol conveys commercial information (e.g., symbol 102; FIG. 1;

*Attorney Docket: 408392*

Specification p. 9-10 ¶[0065]). At least part of this symbol may be reflective. Alternately, at least part of the front face of the pavement tape is reflective (Specification p. 8, ¶¶[0056]-[0057]). The pavement tape is from about 6 to about 12 inches in width (Specification p. 11, ¶[0072]; FIG. 13B). The tape may further include at least one railing that is attachable to the pavement and configured for protecting at least one edge of the tape (e.g., railings 140A, 140B, FIG. 13D; Specification p. 12, ¶[0078]).

Features of claims 1-8 and 11 may be further understood in the embodiments described throughout pages 5-12 of the Specification.

The invention of claim 9 relates to a pavement tape for conveying information when affixed to pavement. The tape (e.g., tape 200, FIGs. 14-16) includes a continuous elongated flexible tape body (e.g., tape body 201, FIGs. 14-16) with front and rear faces (Specification p. 3, ¶[0010]; front and rear faces 10 and 12, FIG. 5 as amended 5/24/2005). The front face has at least one symbol that conveys information, formed as a perforation extending at least partly from the front face to the rear face of the tape body (e.g., symbol 202, FIGs. 14-16, Specification, p. 13 ¶[0081]). The front and rear faces are exposed at an end of the continuous elongated flexible tape body (see, e.g., FIG. 17).

Features of claim 9 may be further understood in the embodiments described in paragraphs ¶¶[0079]-[0082] and ¶[0089], found on pages 12-13 and 15 of the Specification.

The invention of claim 10 relates to a pavement tape for conveying information when affixed to pavement. The tape has an elongated flexible tape body with front and rear faces (e.g., tape 200, tape body 201 and front and rear faces 10 and 12, FIGs. 1-3A, 17, 19 and 21). The front face includes at least one symbol that conveys information (e.g., symbol 102, FIGs. 1-3A; symbol 202, FIGs. 14-17, Specification p. 3 ¶¶[0010]-[0011]). A mask tape (e.g., mask tape 213, FIG. 18) includes a flexible mask tape body (e.g., mask tape body 212, FIG. 18) with front and rear mask faces and at least one symbol (e.g., symbol 211, FIG. 18) formed as a perforation extending from the front mask face to the rear mask face (Specification, pp. 13-14, ¶[0083]; p. 15, ¶[0089]). The

Attorney Docket: 408392

rear mask face is bonded to the front face of the pavement tape (Specification p. 14 ¶[0087]; FIGs. 20-22).

Features of claim 10 may also be understood in the embodiments described in paragraphs ¶¶[0083]-[0087], found on pages 13-14 of the Specification.

The inventions of claims 28-34 relate to a pavement tape (e.g., tape 100, FIGs. 1-3A; tape 118, 119, 120; FIG. 13B) with a continuous elongated flexible unitary tape body of homogenous composition, including a front face and a continuously flat rear face (e.g., tape body 101, FIGs. 1-3A; Specification p. 3, ¶[0011]; front face 10 and rear face 12, FIG. 5, amended 5/24/2005; Specification p. 8, ¶[0058], also amended 5/24/2005). The rear face is configured to be affixed to a durable surface of a road or walkway (e.g., crosswalk 123, pavement 121, FIG. 13B; parking lot 136, FIG. 13C; Specification p. 3 ¶¶[0010]-[0013]). The front face bears at least one symbol (e.g., symbols 102, FIGs. 1-3A). The symbol conveys information to persons traveling over the road or walkway (Specification p. 11, ¶[0072]), and is printed on the front face (Specification, p. 7, ¶[0052]).

Claims 29-34 further relate to a pavement tape having an adhesive (e.g., adhesive 112, FIG. 10) on its rear face (Specification p. 10, ¶[0066]), for bonding the pavement tape to the durable surface of a road or walkway (e.g., pavement 110, FIG. 11). One face of a flexible release tape (e.g., release tape 114, FIG. 12) is releasably bonded to the adhesive (Specification, p. 10, ¶[0069]). One face of a flexible protective tape (e.g., protective tape 108, FIGs. 6-12) is releasably bonded to the front face of the pavement tape (Specification, pp. 8-9, ¶[0059]). The at least one symbol printed on the front face conveys commercial information (Specification, p. 3, ¶[0011]; p. 7, ¶[0052]). The continuous elongated flexible unitary tape body is from about 6 to about 12 inches in width (Specification p. 11, ¶[0072]; FIG. 13B). One or more of (a) at least part of the at least one symbol and (b) said front face, is reflective (Specification p. 8, ¶¶[0056]-[0057]).

*Attorney Docket: 408392*

Features of claims 28-34 may also be understood in the embodiments described in paragraphs ¶¶[0071]-[0077], found on pages 11-12 of the Specification.

**(6) Grounds for rejection to be reviewed on appeal.**

- (A) Whether claims 1-8, 11 and 28-34 are unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement.
- (B) Whether claims 1-5, 7-8, 11, 28-32 and 34 are unpatentable over 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) in view of Bastiaens.
- (C) Whether claims 6 and 33 are unpatentable over U.S.C. § 103(a), due to Bastiaens.

**(7) Argument.**

In order to facilitate consideration of Applicant's claims against the Bastiaens patent, we first provide a general discussion and comparison of Bastiaens versus the '943 Application and claims. We then address and argue the rejection of claims 1-16. Because the July 17, 2006 amendment to claim 1 was not entered, we argue claim 1 as pending prior to this amendment.

General Discussion.

Before addressing the specific patentable elements of the aforementioned claims, we note that prior office actions suggest a fundamental confusion as to the invention and process of the Bastiaens patent. We therefore provide the following discussion in an attempt to clarify.

Bastiaens recites an electrographic process for making a base construction that is useful in making retroreflective graphic articles. In this process, an image is electrographically printed on a transfer sheet. The imaged transfer sheet is then pressed against a receptor sheet, at an elevated temperature, to transfer the image to the surface of the receptor sheet. The receptor sheet includes glass microspheres enclosed within a

*Attorney Docket: 408392*

binder layer. A specular reflective layer, such as a "vapor deposited aluminum film" underlies the binder layer. Bastiaens col. 4, lines 13-14. An adhesive layer is shown underlying the specular reflective layer, and an optional removable release liner is shown underlying the adhesive. See Bastiaens col. 2, line 63 – col. 3, line 6; FIG. 2.

Following image transfer, the image transfer sheet is collected by a pickup roll. The imaged receptor sheet is collected on a separate pickup roll. At this point, the receptor sheet is described as "suitable for making retroreflective articles." See Bastiaens col. 2, line 63 – col. 3, line 22; FIGs. 2 and 3.

In order to make the retroreflective article from the receptor sheet, a transparent cover film is applied over the image, by contacting the cover film with the imaged receptor sheet, and passing the two through pressure rolls, "to provide an imaged retroreflective article." See Bastiaens col. 3, lines 23-32; FIG. 4. Preferably, a clear film is next applied (e.g., by lamination or as a topcoat) over the image. See Bastiaens col. 4, lines 53-54; col. 4, line 66 - col. 5, line 15.

Argument (A).

Claims 1-8, 11 and 28-34 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. We respectfully disagree.

These claims do not stand or fall together.

Claim 1: In particular, in the final office action of May 15, 2006, the Examiner stated that the phrase "homogeneous composition" in claim 1 (and also claim 28, argued below) was not supported by the '943 Application, as originally filed, because of lack of any definition therefor in the specification. The Examiner also stated that the meaning of this phrase was unclear.

In response, we clarified that a homogeneous material is uniform in structure or composition throughout. *The American Heritage® Dictionary of the English Language, Fourth Edition, Copyright © 2000 by Houghton Mifflin Company.* "Consistent" and "uniform" are exemplary synonyms of "homogeneous".

Regarding the Examiner's assertion of lack of support for the term "homogeneous composition," we noted that "While there is no *in haec verba* requirement, newly added

*Attorney Docket: 408392*

claim limitations must be supported in the specification through express, implicit, *or inherent* disclosure." MPEP § 2163(I)(B), emphasis added. We argued, and we maintain, that the limitation of homogeneous composition is inherently disclosed in the specification, at least because the specification references the drawings, which show a homogenous (e.g., consistent or uniform) tape body. See, e.g., tape body 101, Figs. 5-13.

Per MPEP § 2163.06, "...information contained in any one of the specification, claims or drawings of the application as filed may be added to any other part of the application without introducing new matter." The amendment to claim 1 constitutes the addition of pictorial information from the drawings into the claim, and is therefore acceptable and in compliance with 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph.

Furthermore, we submit that this pictorial information (e.g., of FIGs. 5-13) supports Applicant's possession of a homogenous tape body. Regarding possession, in describing the guidelines for the examination of patent applications under the 35 U.S.C. § 112, paragraph 1, "Written Description" Requirement, it is clearly stated that:

"An applicant shows possession of the claimed invention by describing the claimed invention with all of its limitations using such descriptive means as words, structures, *figures*, *diagrams*, and formulas that fully set forth the claimed invention. *Lockwood v. American Airlines, Inc.*, 107 F.3d 1565, 1572, 41 USPQ2d 1961, 1966 (Fed. Cir. 1997)." MPEP § 2163(I), emphasis added.

For at least these reasons, we believe that claim 1 complies with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 112. Withdrawal of the Examiner's rejection is therefore respectfully requested.

As an aside, we note that the Examiner rejects claim 1 as not finding specific support in the specification. However, in order to maintain consistency between the claims, drawings and specification, and because MPEP § 2163.06 permits, we did present an amendment to the specification in our July 17, 2006 response. This amendment referenced a "homogeneous" tape body. We submit that the amendment to the specification should have been entered because, contrary to the Examiner's assertion, it

*Attorney Docket: 408392*

did not add new matter (see above argument directed to importing drawing features into "any other part" of an application; see also FIGs. 5-13). We therefore also request entry of the amendment to the specification filed July 17, 2006.

*Claim 2:* Claim 2 depends from claim 1 and benefits from like argument. In addition, claim 2 is original. The claims are considered a part of the application, thus, the recited rear face with adhesive for bonding pavement tape to pavement is also supported by the '943 Application as filed. See also supporting FIGs. 2, 5-13 and Specification p. 3, ¶[0011]. We respectfully request withdrawal of the Examiner's rejection.

*Claim 3:* Claim 3 depends from claim 1 through intervening claim 2, and therefore benefits from like argument. Claim 3 is also original, and therefore supported by the '943 Application as filed. See also FIGs. 12, 13 depicting the recited flexible release tape. Claim 2 therefore complies with 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph. Accordingly, we respectfully request withdrawal of the Examiner's rejection.

*Claim 4:* Claim 4 depends from claim 1, and therefore benefits from like argument. Claim 4 is also original, and therefore supported by the '943 Application as filed. See also FIGs. 6-13 depicting the recited flexible protective tape. Claim 3 therefore complies with 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph. Withdrawal of the Examiner's rejection is respectfully requested.

*Claim 5:* Claim 5 is likewise original and therefore supported by the '943 Application as filed. See description of symbols conveying commercial information at Specification p. 3, ¶[0011]; p. 11 ¶[0072]-[0074]; see also FIGs. 13B and 13C. Claim 5 also depends from claim 1 through intervening claim 2, and benefits from like argument. Claim 3 therefore complies with 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph. Accordingly, withdrawal of the Examiner's rejection is respectfully requested.

*Claim 6:* Claim 6 also depends from claim 1, benefiting from like argument. Furthermore, claim 6 is original and therefore supported by the '943 Application and in compliance with 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph. See also Specification p. 11, ¶[0072] and FIG. 13B for additional support. Withdrawal of the Examiner's rejection is respectfully requested.

*Attorney Docket: 408392*

Claim 7: This claim likewise depends from claim 1 and benefits from like argument. Furthermore, claim 7 complies with 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph at least because it is original and therefore is supported by the '943 Application as filed. In addition, the '943 specification as filed describes the at least partially reflective symbol. See, e.g., Specification p. 8, lines 9-10 of ¶[0056]. We submit that claim 7 complies with 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph. We therefore respectfully request withdrawal of the Examiner's rejection.

Claim 8: Claim 8 also depends from claim 1, benefiting from like argument. Claim 7 is additionally original, therefore the recited limitation of an at least partially reflective front face is supported by the '943 Application as filed. In addition, this limitation is taught and depicted by the original specification and drawings. See, e.g., Specification pp. 7-8, ¶¶[0055]-[0056]; FIG. 4. Claim 8 therefore also complies with 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph. Withdrawal of the Examiner's rejection is respectfully requested.

Claim 11: Claim 11 also depends from claim 1 and benefits from like argument. See also FIG. 13D and Specification p. 12, ¶[0078], for exemplary support for the recited at least one railing. Claim 11 thus complies with 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, and we respectfully request withdrawal of the Examiner's rejection.

Claim 28: Claim 28 recites a pavement tape having:

- a continuous elongated flexible unitary tape body of homogenous composition, including:
  - a front face and
  - a continuously flat rear face;
- the rear face configured to be affixed to a durable surface of a road or walkway; and
- the front face bearing at least one symbol that conveys information to persons traveling over the road or walkway, wherein the symbol is printed on the front face.

Attorney Docket: 408392

In rejecting claim 28, the Examiner maintains that the phrase "homogeneous composition" was not supported by the '943 Application, as originally filed, because of lack of any definition therefor in the specification.

As noted above with respect to claim 1, "While there is no *in haec verba* requirement, newly added claim limitations must be supported in the specification through express, implicit, *or inherent* disclosure. MPEP 2163(I)(B), emphasis added. We argued, and we maintain, that the limitation homogeneous composition is inherently disclosed in the specification, at least because the specification references the drawings, which show a homogenous (for example, consistent or uniform) tape body. See, e.g.,

Figs. 5-13.

Again, "information contained in any one of the specification, claims *or drawings* of the application as filed *may be added to any other part of the application* without introducing new matter." MPEP § 2163.06, emphasis added. The amendment to claim 28 constitutes the addition of pictorial information from the drawings into the claim, and is therefore acceptable and in compliance with 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph.

Furthermore, we submit that this pictorial information (e.g., of FIGs. 5-13) supports Applicant's possession of a homogenous tape body. Regarding possession, in describing the guidelines for the examination of patent applications under the 35 U.S.C. § 112, paragraph 1, "Written Description" Requirement, it is clearly stated that:

"An applicant shows possession of the claimed invention by describing the claimed invention with all of its limitations using such descriptive means as words, structures, *figures*, *diagrams*, and formulas that fully set forth the claimed invention. *Lockwood v. American Airlines, Inc.*, 107 F.3d 1565, 1572, 41 USPQ2d 1961, 1966 (Fed. Cir. 1997)." MPEP § 2163(I), emphasis added.

For at least these reasons, we believe that claim 28 complies with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 112. Withdrawal of the Examiner's rejection is therefore respectfully requested.

*Attorney Docket: 408392*

*Claim 29:* Claim 29 depends from claim 28, and benefits from like argument. Claim 29 includes the additional limitation of a pavement tape with a rear face having an adhesive for bonding the pavement tape to the durable surface of a road or walkway. This limitation is fully supported by the '943 Application as filed. See, e.g., FIGs. 10, 11, 13B, 17, 21 and 22; Specification p. 11, ¶¶[0071], [0072] and [0074]. We submit that claim 29 complies with 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, and we respectfully request withdrawal of the Examiner's rejection.

*Claim 30:* Claim 30 depends from claim 28, through intervening claim 29, and benefits from like argument. Claim 30 also recites a flexible release tape, which is fully supported by the '943 Application as filed. See, e.g., FIGs. 12, 13; Specification p. 10, ¶[0068]. We submit that claim 29 complies with 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph. Accordingly, withdrawal of the Examiner's rejection is respectfully requested.

*Claim 31:* Claim 31 also depends from claim 28, thus benefiting from like argument. Claim 31 additionally recites a flexible protective tape, which is fully supported by the '943 Application as filed. See, e.g., FIGs. 9, 10; Specification p. 8, ¶[0059]. Claim 31 is in compliance with 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph. We therefore respectfully request withdrawal of the Examiner's rejection.

*Claim 32:* Claim 32 likewise depends from claim 28 and benefits from like argument. Claim 32 further recites that the at least one symbol conveys commercial information. See Specification p. 8, ¶¶[0072]-[0074] and claim 12 as filed' for exemplary (and original) support for claim 32. We submit that claim 32 complies with 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, and we respectfully request withdrawal of the Examiner's rejection.

*Claim 33:* Claim 33 likewise depends from claim 28 and benefits from like argument. Claim 33 additionally recites the fully supported limitation of a tape body that is about 6 to about 12 inches in width. See Specification p. 11, ¶[0072]. Claim 33 thus complies with 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph. Withdrawal of the Examiner's rejection is respectfully requested.

*Claim 34:* Finally, claim 34 depends from claim 28, thus benefiting from like argument. Claim 34 also recites the fully supported limitation of one or more of (a) at

*Attorney Docket: 408392*

least part of the at least one symbol, and (b) the front face being reflective. See Specification p. 8, ¶¶[0056]-[0057]; FIG. 4. Respectfully, we submit that claim 34 complies with 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph. Withdrawal of the Examiner's rejection is accordingly requested.

Argument (B).

In order to anticipate claims 1-5, 7-8, 11, 28-32 and 34, Bastiaens must teach every element of each claim and "the *identical invention* must be shown in as complete detail as contained in the ... claim." *MPEP 2131*, citing *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 2 USPQ2d 1051 (Fed. Cir. 1987) and *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1226, 9 USPQ2d 1913 (Fed. Cir. 1989), emphasis added. However, Bastiaens does not teach or suggest each and every claim limitation within claims 1-5, 7-8, 11, 28-32 and 34, as required by 35 U.S.C. § 102(c). These claims do not stand or fall together.

Claim 1: Claim 1 recites a pavement tape for conveying information when affixed to pavement, including:

- a continuous elongated flexible tape body of homogeneous composition, said tape body configured for affixing to pavement and comprising:
  - a front face and
  - a continuously flat rear face,
  - wherein at least one symbol printed upon said front face conveys information, and
  - wherein the front and rear faces are exposed at an end of the continuous elongated flexible tape body.

Bastiaens does not teach or suggest a tape body of homogeneous composition (again, we maintain that this limitation of claim 1 complies with 35 U.S.C. § 112). Bastiaens instead teaches against a homogeneous tape body by specifically reciting a receptor sheet (which the Examiner has likened to Applicant's tape body 101, 201) that includes a base material of non-homogeneous composition.

*Attorney Docket: 408392*

For example, "the surface of the base material comprises a binder layer of polyvinyl butyral resin having glass microspheres enclosed therein and a specular reflective layer underlying and spaced apart from the microspheres by the resin." Bastiaens col. 1, lines 51-55, emphasis added; see also FIGs. 2 and 4. This mixed binder layer of the surface is not homogenous, because it is not consistent in composition (e.g., having glass microspheres suspended throughout the binder layer). We maintain that if a part of the base material is not homogeneous (e.g., the mixed binder layer), then the base material as a whole is also not homogeneous.

Again, the base material is a part of the receptor sheet. Note that microspheres 32, binder layer 30 and specular layer 34 are shown and described as components of receptor sheet 18. See Bastiaens' FIGs. 2, 4 and col. 2, line 63 – col. 3, line 6. We maintain, that if a part of Bastiaens' receptor sheet (e.g., the base material) is not homogeneous, then neither is her receptor sheet 18 as a whole. Bastiaens therefore does not teach a tape body of homogeneous composition.

The Examiner stated that this argument was not persuasive, "because, as shown in figure-2 of Bastiaens, the layers 34 or 30 are found to be homogenous." Final office action mailed 5/15/2006, "Response to Arguments", ¶2. We continue to disagree. Layer 30 is not consistent, or homogeneous, in composition. In some places, it includes glass microspheres, and in others, it does not. Bastiaens' receptor sheet 18 fails to anticipate Applicant's tape body 101, because it is clearly not homogenous. Compare, for example, receptor sheet 18 in Bastiaens FIGs. 2 and 4 with Applicant's tape body 101, in FIGs. 5-13.

The Examiner has also offered the alternate rejection that:

"...the instant claimed invention does not preclude the presence of additional components in the "homogeneous" tape body. To further explain, applicant is reminded that the recited claims 1 and 28 are directed to open language and, as such, does not preclude the presence of additional components therein. Hence, Bastiaens' body 18 has been interpreted to read on the claimed tape body, while said tape body includes

Attorney Docket: 408392

for example a resin layer 30 that is shown to be "homogeneous. In response to applicant's argument about the presence of glass microspheres in the resin layer...the presence of said microspheres is not precluded by the open claim language." Advisory action p. 2, ¶3.

Respectfully, whether or not "comprising" is open-ended, imbuing Applicant's claim 1 with a resin layer and enclosed glass microspheres, as the Examiner does, is antithetical to "homogeneous composition." For example, if one took a tape body of homogeneous composition and placed microspheres therein, we submit that the tape body would no longer be homogeneous. It would instead be heterogeneous, and cross-sections taken along the tape body would differ from one another in composition.

We submit that reading antithetical limitations into the claims, as the Examiner appears to do under the guise of open language, is akin to Applicant adding a new claim to this effect:

"The pavement tape of claim 1, wherein the tape body of homogeneous composition is not homogeneous."

We do not believe that this would be permissible; thus, we submit that it is also not permissible to read in limitations that are opposite the meaning of the claim language. Contrary to the Examiner's position, we believe that open claim language does preclude unrecited elements/components that stand in opposition to the written limitations. Consideration of this argument is respectfully requested.

If this case is remanded to the Examiner and the Examiner remains unsatisfied with the phrase "homogeneous composition", we further request that the Examiner propose alternate language to describe the notable difference between Applicant's tape body and Bastiaens receptor sheet 18. This difference is clearly seen in comparing Applicant's FIGs. 5-13 with Bastiaens FIG. 4). Per MPEP 2173.02:

*"Examiners are encouraged to suggest claim language to applicants to improve the clarity or precision of the language used, but should not reject claims or insist on their own preferences if other modes of*

Attorney Docket: 408392

expression selected by applicants satisfy the statutory requirement."

Emphasis added.

We believe that claim 1 is patentable over Bastiaens at least in light of the above argument. We therefore request withdrawal of the Examiner's rejection, and allowance of independent claim 1.

Claim 2: Claim 2 depends from claim 1 and benefits from like argument, namely, that Bastiaens does not teach a tape body of homogeneous composition. In addition, claim 2 adds the limitation of the rear face having adhesive for bonding pavement tape to pavement. Bastiaens does not teach this limitation, in the context of claim 1. We respectfully request withdrawal of the Examiner's rejection.

Claim 3: Claim 3 depends from claim 1 through intervening claim 2, and therefore benefits from like argument. Claim 3 adds the additional limitation of a flexible release tape, one face of which is releasably bonded to said adhesive. Bastiaens does not teach a tape body of homogeneous composition, with said release tape. Accordingly, we respectfully request withdrawal of the Examiner's rejection.

Claim 4: Claim 4 depends from claim 1, and therefore benefits from like argument. In addition, Claim 4 recites a flexible protective tape, one face of which is releasably bonded to the front face of Applicant's pavement tape.

The Examiner has repeatedly argued that Bastiaens teaches this limitation, stating "as clearly seen in figure-21 of Bastiaens, the layer (7) is a tape that protects the image and the top surface until it is removed therefrom." Final office action of 5/15/2006, p. 4, lines 7-8. Respectfully, we strongly disagree and submit that this is incorrect. Bastiaens' transfer sheet 7 is not a tape, and Bastiaens nowhere teaches or suggests that it serves a protective function.

First, there is no mention of any adhesive property accorded to Bastiaens' transfer sheet. For example, Bastiaens clearly states that "the image transfer sheet 7 comprises a paper support base 3." Bastiaens col. 2, line 42-43. Next, as is well known in the art of image transfer, a transfer sheet holds an image which is then transferred to a separate substrate. It is typically utilized only for the purpose of transferring the image, after

Attorney Docket: 408392

which it is thrown away or recycled. It does not form a part of the final product. Accordingly, Bastiaens specifically teaches that the transfer sheet (7) is used in making the retroreflective article, but it is not a part of the finished product:

"The printer 100 uses electrostatic means to form and develop a latent electrostatic image on an image transfer sheet 7 which may be a single sheet or a continuous web. The image transfer sheet 7 comprises a paper support base 3 having first a conductive layer 2 and then a dielectric layer 4. A release coating 6 may be applied to the dielectric layer 4 to facilitate transfer of an image. The surface of the image transfer sheet 7 having the release coating 6 proceeds in a direction 8 first passing a stylus writing head 10 which deposits a charge 12 having varying charge density to define a latent electrostatic image. After passing the writing head 10, the image transfer sheet 7 passes a toning station comprising a toner applicator 16 in contact with a liquid toner bath 18 in a container 20 [sic]. The liquid toner comprises toner particles dispersed in an insulating liquid and are collectively referred to as the liquid toner bath 18. Liquid toner 22 is transported by the applicator 16 to the image transfer sheet 7 and deposited to form a toned image 24 conforming to the latent electrostatic image 12." Bastiaens col. 2, lines 38-57; FIG. 1. Furthermore, "The image transfer sheet web 28 and the receptor sheet web 38 pass through the nip 40 of rollers 42, 44 where heat and pressure are applied *to transfer the toned image 24 from the image transfer sheet web 28 to the surface 33 of binder layer 30 of the receptor sheet web 38. The continuous webs 28, 38 are collected by pickup rolls 36, 34. The imaged receptor sheet provides a base construction suitable for making retroreflective articles.*" Bastiaens col. 3, lines 15-22, emphasis added.

Bastiaens' FIG. 3 illustrates image transfer sheet web 28 being collected on a pickup roll after transfer of the toned image. As is clearly shown and described, the imaged receptor sheet web 34 is collected on a different pickup roll. The product on the

---

18 of 34

APPEAL BRIEF

Submitted in Response to the Final Office Action Dated 08/02/2006 in U.S. Serial No. 10/633,943

*Attorney Docket: 408392*

receptor sheet web 34 (which again does not include the transfer sheet) is then suitable for making retroreflective articles. The transfer sheet is plainly not a part of the base construction that is used to make Bastiaens' retroreflective articles.

Respectfully, the Examiner's ruling indicates a misunderstanding of the process of image transfer. In image transfer of the type practiced in Bastiaens, the transfer sheet typically does not include any adhesive. Indeed, Bastiaens lists Trident Transfer Paper ES as a suitable transfer sheet. In our Response of February 24, 2006, we provided the Examiner with the Product Bulletin for Trident Transfer Paper ES. This bulletin does not mention any adhesive properties. This is not surprising, because common sense teaches against using a tape or even an adhesive paper as the transfer sheet in Bastiaens.

For example, if Bastiaens were to use a sticky transfer sheet or a tape, the transfer paper would likely stick to itself when wound on feed roll 20. This would make it difficult to cleanly pass the transfer sheet web through Bastiaens' image transfer station 300. Furthermore, if transfer sheet 7 included an adhesive, it might melt when passed "through the nip 40 of rollers 42, 44 where heat and pressure are applied." Bastiaens col. 3, lines 15-16. This would likely leave a residue not only on roller 42, potentially gumming up the image transfer station. In addition, the transfer sheet would stick to the receptor sheet. When pulled apart, the receptor sheet could easily be damaged. At the very least, a residue would likely be left on the receptor sheet, causing the receptor sheet to stick to itself when wound on pickup roll 34. This could cause damage to the finished receptor sheet, for example when a person or machine attempts to un-wind it from pickup roll 34. See Bastiaens' FIG. 3.

Bastiaens recites that the transfer sheet feed roll 20 can be positioned before or after a printer. In addition to the above drawbacks, if Bastiaens used a sticky transfer paper or tape, the following scenarios could result:

(i) With roll 20 positioned before printer 100:

In this case, as noted above, the transfer sheet web would likely stick to itself on roll 20, leaving a residue upon the transfer sheet when unwound for printing. Therefore, images would not be applied to a clean receptor sheet at printer 100, but to a sheet

Attorney Docket: 408392

bearing an adhesive residue. This would likely degrade image quality and stability on the receptor sheet. See Bastiaens FIG. 3.

(ii) With roll 20 positioned after printer 100:

In this case (although Bastiaens teaches nothing of the sort) images would presumably be printed on an adhesive-free side of the transfer sheet, prior to winding upon roll 20. However, winding the imaged sheet upon roll 20 would cause the adhesive side of the transfer sheet to contact the imaged side. As noted above, the wound transfer sheet would likely stick to itself, causing difficulty in feeding the sheet through the image transfer station. In addition, part or all of the images could be pulled from the imaged side of the transfer sheet to the adhesive side, during unwinding. This would result in a lesser quality image, or no image at all, being transferred to the receptor sheet at pressure rolls 42, 44. See Bastiaens FIG. 3.

As shown, not only is Bastiaens completely silent as to any adhesive on transfer sheet 7, logic also teaches against such an adhesive. Furthermore, Applicant's claim 4 recites a protective tape. Bastiaens nowhere describes transfer sheet 7 as having a protective function.

Respectfully, Bastiaens' transfer sheet does not provide sufficient basis for an anticipation rejection. Transfer sheet 7 is not a tape, it is not bonded to Bastiaens' base construction, and Bastiaens nowhere indicates that it has any protective function.

Since Bastiaens fails to expressly teach the limitations of claim 4, it appears that the Examiner is rejecting claim 4 based upon an inherency argument (per MPEP § 2131, a claim is only anticipated if every element is found, either expressly or inherently). We must therefore point out the inappropriateness of the Examiner's repeated comment that "Applicant has failed to show" that transfer sheet (7) does not provide protection to Bastiaens' tape. See advisory action p. 2, ¶6 and final office action of 5/16/06, p. 4, lines 9-10.

In cases of inherency, the burden of proof lies not with Applicant, but with the Examiner. MPEP § 2112 states:

*Attorney Docket: 408392*

"In relying upon the theory of inherency, the examiner must provide a basis in fact and/or technical reasoning to reasonably support the determination that the allegedly inherent characteristic necessarily flows from the teachings of the applied prior art. *Ex parte Levy*, 17 USPQ2D 1461, 1464 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1990)."

Although we have pointed out this responsibility, the Examiner has yet to provide any basis in fact or technical reasoning to support the allegation that transfer sheet 7 is a tape, or that transfer sheet 7 has a protective function. We contend that such factual support or technical reasoning cannot be found, especially in light of Bastiaens' specific teaching that transfer sheet 7 is used to transfer an image to a receptor sheet. In addition, as noted, logic teaches away from transfer sheet 7 having adhesive properties at all. The Examiner's rejection of claim 4 therefore fails, and we respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection.

*Claim 5:* Claim 5 likewise depends from claim 1, and benefits from like argument. namely, that Bastiaens does not teach a tape body of homogeneous composition. In addition, claim 5 adds the limitation of the at least one symbol conveying commercial information. Bastiaens does not teach this limitation of claim 5, in the context of claim 1.

*Claim 7:* Claim 7 also depends from claim 1 and benefits from like argument, namely, that Bastiaens does not teach a tape body of homogeneous composition. In addition, claim 2 recites an at least partially reflective symbol. We presented arguments demonstrating that Bastiaens does not teach this limitation. The Examiner felt that our arguments did not make sense (see final office action of 5/16/06), and we provided clarifying remarks in our Response of July 17, 2006. Because these remarks were not addressed in the advisory action of 8/2/2006, they are reiterated herein. We respectfully request consideration of the following:

Bastiaens recites a retroreflective article with an image on a base material, wherein "the surface of the base material comprises a binder layer of polyvinyl butyral resin having glass microspheres enclosed therein and a specular reflective layer

*Attorney Docket: 408392*

underlying and spaced apart from the microspheres by the resin." col. 1, lines 53-55; see also FIG. 2 and col. 2, line 63 - col. 3, line 4. "The receptor sheet is a base material comprising glass microspheres that provide a low level of retroreflectivity. The glass microspheres are dispersed throughout the binder layer and are present substantially as a monolayer dispersed in the binder layer with an underlying specular reflective layer spaced from the microspheres by the transparent binder material." Bastiaens col. 4, lines 4-10. An image is transferred to this base material, in particular, "to the side of the base material closest to the microspheres and opposite the reflective layer." Bastiaens col. 4, lines 34-35. In other words, the base material (e.g., the specular reflective layer and the glass microspheres), and not the symbol itself, appear to be reflective in Bastiaens.

On the other hand, claim 7 recites that at least part of the symbol itself is reflective. Again, absent an express teaching of a reflective (or partially reflective) symbol by Bastiaens, the Examiner appears to be making an inherency argument. However, the Examiner has not provided any basis in fact, or any technical reasoning, to support the opinion that Bastiaens' image is at least partially reflective (though we have pointed out that this is the Examiner's responsibility). Since Bastiaens does not teach a reflective symbol, we believe that such basis cannot be found. We believe that the rejection of claim 7 therefore fails. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claim 8: Claim 8 also depends from claim 1, and benefits from like argument. Furthermore, claim 8 recites that at least part of the tape body front face is reflective. The limitations of claim 8 are simply not taught in the context of claim 1. For example, Bastiaens fails to teach a pavement tape with a tape body of homogeneous composition and an at least partially reflective front face. Withdrawal of the rejection is accordingly requested.

Claim 11: Claim 11 also depends from claim 1 and benefits from like argument. Claim 11 also recites the unique limitation of at least one railing attachable to the pavement and configured for protecting at least one edge of said pavement tape.

*Attorney Docket: 408392*

The Examiner stated that the claim 11 railing was not given patentable weight because it was "not found to be of positive limitation, as it is attached to the intended use pavement and not part of the claimed tape." Office action of 10/24/2005, p. 5, ¶3. We presented arguments that the railing is a part of the tape, which the Examiner did not accept. See final office action of 5/16/2006 p. 4, ¶4. We have since clarified our position; however, the Examiner has not addressed our argument.

As previously argued, claim 11 recites "The pavement tape of claim 1 further comprising at least one railing". As noted in MPEP § 2111.03, "The transitional term "comprising" ... is synonymous with "including," "containing," or "characterized by". The transitional term "comprising" (and other comparable terms, e.g., "containing," and "including") is "open-ended"- *it covers the expressly recited subject matter*, alone or in combination with unrecited subject matter." MPEP § 2163(II)(a)(1), emphasis added. In other words, "Comprising" is a term of art used in claim language which means that the named elements are essential, but other elements may be added and still form a construct within the scope of the claim. MPEP § 2111.03, quoting *Moleculon Research Corp. v. CBS, Inc.*, 793 F.2d 1261, 229 USPQ 805 (Fed. Cir. 1986); *In re Baxter*, 656 F.2d 679, 686, 210 USPQ 795, 803 (CCPA 1981); *Ex parte Davis*, 80 USPQ 448, 450 (Bd. App. 1948).

As supported by the above teachings, claim 11 covers a pavement tape including the expressly recited at least one protective railing. We therefore contend that this railing does indeed have patentable weight. Bastiaens is completely silent as to any railing; therefore claim 11 is not anticipated. Withdrawal of the Examiner's rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) is respectfully requested.

The Examiner recently commented that our claim 11 argument was an admission that "comprising" is open language, and attempted to use this argument as support for his rejection of the "homogeneous composition" limitation of claims 1 and 28. We therefore submit once more that whether or not "comprising" is open language, it is not appropriate (and we believe it is also impermissible) to read in limitations that contradict expressly written limitations (e.g., reading glass microspheres into Applicant's

*Attorney Docket: 408392*

homogeneous tape body). The MPEP quotations presented above do not indicate or even suggest that open claim language covers unrecited subject matter that would change the meaning of the claim (e.g., contradicting expressly recited limitations)

*Claim 28:* Turning now to claim 28, what is described is a pavement tape having:

- a continuous elongated flexible unitary tape body of homogenous composition, including:
  - a front face and
  - a continuously flat rear face;
- the rear face configured to be affixed to a durable surface of a road or walkway; and
- the front face bearing at least one symbol that conveys information to persons traveling over the road or walkway, wherein the symbol is printed on the front face.

As noted above with respect to claim 1, Bastiaens does not teach or suggest a tape body of homogeneous composition (and we maintain that this limitation of claim 28 complies with 35 U.S.C. § 112). Bastiaens instead teaches against a homogeneous tape body by specifically reciting a heterogeneous receptor sheet 18 (which the Examiner has likened to Applicant's tape body 101, 201).

For example, the receptor sheet includes a base material and "the surface of the base material comprises a binder layer of polyvinyl butyral resin having glass microspheres enclosed therein and a specular reflective layer underlying and spaced apart from the microspheres by the resin." Bastiaens col. 1, lines 51-55, emphasis added; see also FIGs. 2 and 4. This mixed binder layer is not homogeneous, because it is not consistent in composition (e.g., having glass microspheres in some places, but not in others). If this element of the base material is not homogeneous (e.g., the mixed binder layer), then we submit that the base material as a whole is also not homogeneous.

Again, the base material is a part of the receptor sheet. Note that microspheres 32, binder layer 30 and specular layer 34 are shown and described as components of receptor sheet 18. See Bastiaens' FIGs. 2, 4 and col. 2, line 63 – col. 3, line 6. If a part of

*Attorney Docket: 408392*

Bastiaens' receptor sheet (e.g., the base material) is not homogeneous, then we submit that neither is the receptor sheet as a whole. Bastiaens does not teach a tape body of homogeneous composition, and is therefore different from (and does not anticipate) Applicant's claim 28. Compare, for example, receptor sheet 18 in Bastiaens FIGs. 2 and 4 with Applicant's tape body 101, in FIGs. 5-13. .

We again strongly disagree with the Examiner's alternate rejection, on the grounds that the open language of claim 28 does not preclude the presence of glass microspheres. See Advisory Section p. 2, second paragraph. We maintain that open claim language does preclude the presence of components/limitations which would change the meaning of the claim, for example by canceling out, or contradicting, expressly written limitations. For this reason, we submit that it is improper to read glass microspheres into Applicant's tape body of homogeneous composition, as doing so would result in a tape body of inconsistent (i.e., heterogeneous) composition. Consideration of this point is respectfully requested.

We believe that claim 1 is patentable over Bastiaens at least in light of the above argument. However, Bastiaens also fails to teach other limitations of claim 1. For example, Bastiaens does not teach or suggest a pavement tape with a symbol printed upon its front face. Withdrawal of the Examiner's rejection is therefore respectfully requested.

Claim 29: Claim 29 depends from claim 28, and benefits from like argument. Claim 29 includes the additional limitation of a pavement tape with a rear face having an adhesive for bonding the pavement tape to the durable surface of a road or walkway. Bastiaens does not teach the limitations of claim 29, in the context of claim 28. For example, Bastiaens does not teach a pavement tape having a tape body of homogeneous composition, and the recited adhesive on its rear face. We thus respectfully request withdrawal of the claim 29 rejection.

Claim 30: Claim also 30 depends from claim 28, through intervening claim 29, and benefits from like argument. Claim 30 also recites a flexible release tape. Bastiaens does not teach the flexible release tape of claim 30, in the context of a pavement tape

Attorney Docket: 408392

having a homogeneous tape body. Withdrawal of the Examiner's rejection is respectfully requested.

Claim 31: Claim 31 also depends from claim 28, thus benefiting from like argument. Claim 31 additionally recites a flexible protective tape. Bastiaens does not teach this limitation, in the context of claim 28. Withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) is thus respectfully requested.

Claim 32: Claim 32 likewise depends from claim 28 and benefits from like argument. Claim 32 further recites that the at least one symbol conveys commercial information. Again, Bastiaens does not teach this limitation of Applicant's claim 32, in the context of claim 28. Withdrawal of the rejection is therefore respectfully requested.

Claim 34: Finally, claim 34 depends from claim 28, thus benefiting from like argument. Claim 34 also recites one or more of (a) at least part of the at least one symbol, and (b) the front face being reflective.

Bastiaens fails to teach at least element (a), above. As noted with respect to the arguments supporting claim 7, Bastiaens does not teach a reflective symbol, but rather teaches a reflective base material. Bastiaens specifies that "the surface of the base material comprises a binder layer of polyvinyl butyral resin having glass microspheres enclosed therein and a specular reflective layer underlying and spaced apart from the microspheres by the resin." col. 1, lines 53-55; see also FIG. 2 and col. 2, line 63 - col. 3, line 4. "The receptor sheet is a base material comprising glass microspheres that provide a low level of retroreflectivity...with an underlying specular reflective layer spaced from the microspheres by the transparent binder material." Bastiaens col. 4, lines 4-10.

The image upon Bastiaens' base material is not described or depicted as reflective, in whole or in part. Absent an express teaching of a reflective (or partially reflective) symbol by Bastiaens, the Examiner appears to again make an inherency argument. We have pointed out that it is the Examiner's responsibility to provide a basis in fact, or any technical reasoning to support the opinion that Bastiaens' image is at least partially reflective. However, we have yet to receive any such fact or reasoning. Since Bastiaens does not teach a reflective symbol, we believe that such basis cannot be found.

*Attorney Docket: 408392*

On the other hand, claim 34 recites that at least part of the symbol itself is reflective. We believe that the rejection of claim 7 therefore fails. In addition, Bastiaens does not teach claim 34 limitation (a) or claim 34 limitation (b), in the context of base claim 28. In other words, Bastiaens at least fails to teach a tape body of homogeneous composition with (a) at least part of a symbol, or (b) the front face, being reflective. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Argument (C).

Claims 6 and 33 stand rejected as being unpatentable in view of Bastiaens, the Examiner stating that it would have been obvious to provide a pavement tape having the width dimensions recited therein. We again respectfully disagree. These claims do not stand or fall together.

Claim 6: Regardless of whether or not the recited width (6-12 inches) of Applicant's pavement tape would have been obvious, claim 6 depends from claim 1. Bastiaens does not render base claim 1 *prima facie* obvious. For example, Bastiaens does not teach or suggest a pavement tape with a tape body of homogeneous composition. Rather, Bastiaens teaches against such a limitation by showing and describing a heterogeneous receptor sheet 18. Bastiaens also teaches away from a homogeneous receptor sheet by specifying that the embedded glass microspheres impart retroreflectivity to the retroreflective graphic article (which is the subject of Bastiaens). See Bastiaens FIG. 4; col. 4, lines 4-14. Thus, it appears that a heterogeneous receptor sheet (e.g., a binder layer with microspheres dispersed throughout) is essential to Bastiaens.

There is therefore neither suggestion nor motivation to replace Bastiaens' heterogeneous receptor sheet with a homogeneous tape body. Absent such suggestion or motivation, Bastiaens cannot establish *prima facie* obviousness over claim 1.

Claim 6 depends from claim 1, and inherits the claim 1 limitations. Courts have ruled that if an independent claim is nonobvious under 35 U.S.C. §103, then any claim depending therefrom is nonobvious. *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071.5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed.

Attorney Docket: 408392

Cir. 1988). Thus, claim 6 is allowable over Bastiaens, at least because it depends from claim 1. Withdrawal of the Examiner's rejection is respectfully requested.

Claim 33: Claim 33 depends from claim 28, and further recites a tape having a width of 6-12 inches. Again, whether or not such dimensions would have been obvious, Bastiaens does not teach or suggest a homogeneous tape body. Rather, Bastiaens recites and depicts a heterogeneous tape body, which seems integral to Bastiaens' retroreflective graphic articles. For example, the glass microspheres that Bastiaens disperses through the binder layer of her receptor sheet are recited as lending a level of retroreflectivity to the graphic article. See Bastiaens FIG. 4; col. 4, lines 4-14.

Bastiaens fails to teach or suggest each and every limitation of base claim 28. There is also no suggestion or motivation within Bastiaens to replace the heterogeneous receptor sheet with a homogeneous tape body, as is recited in base claim 28. Thus, Bastiaens does not meet the necessary criteria for establishing *prima facie* obviousness under 35 U.S.C. §103. See also MPEP § 2142.

Since base claim 28 is nonobvious, dependent claim 33 (which inherits the claim 28 limitations,) is also nonobvious. Courts have ruled that if an independent claim is nonobvious under 35 U.S.C. §103, then any claim depending therefrom is nonobvious. *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071.5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988). Thus, claim 33 is allowable over Bastiaens. Withdrawal of the Examiner's rejection is respectfully requested.

**(8) Claims Appendix.**

Appellants enclose a copy of the claims involved in this appeal as an appendix hereto.

**(9) Evidence Appendix**

Pursuant revised 37 C.F.R. §41.37, an Evidence Appendix is submitted herewith, following the Claims Appendix.

**(10) Related Proceedings Appendix**

Appellants submit herewith a Related Proceedings Appendix following the Evidence Appendix, as required pursuant revised 37 C.F.R. §41.37.

---

28 of 34

APPEAL BRIEF

Submitted in Response to the Final Office Action Dated 08/02/2006 in U.S. Serial No. 10/633,943

*Attorney Docket: 408392*

**(11) Conclusions.**

Applicant respectfully submits that the claims 1-16 patentably distinguish over the art of record. Other than the \$250 total fee for filing a notice of appeal and this appeal brief, no fees are believed due in connection with the '943 Application. However, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees which may be deemed necessary in this case to Deposit Account Number 12-0600.

Respectfully submitted,

LATHROP & GAGE LC

By:

*Curtis A. Vock*  
Curtis A. Vock, Reg. No. 38,356  
4845 Pearl East Circle, Suite 300  
Boulder, Colorado 80301  
Tel: (720) 931-3000  
Fax: (720) 931-3001

29 of 34

APPEAL BRIEF

Submitted in Response to the Final Office Action Dated 08/02/2006 in U.S. Serial No. 10/633,943

PAGE 34/39 \* RCVD AT 8/25/2006 6:25:48 PM [Eastern Daylight Time] \* SVR:USPTO-EFXRF-1/14 \* DNI:2738300 \* CSID:7209313001 \* DURATION (mm:ss):12:00

**BEST AVAILABLE COPY**

Attorney Docket: 408392

## CLAIMS APPENDIX TO APPEAL BRIEF

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER  
AUG 25 2006

What is claimed is:

1. (Previously Presented) A pavement tape for conveying information when affixed to pavement, said pavement tape comprising a continuous elongated flexible tape body of homogeneous composition, said tape body configured for affixing to pavement and comprising a front face and a continuously flat rear face, wherein at least one symbol printed upon said front face conveys information, and wherein the front and rear faces are exposed at an end of the continuous elongated flexible tape body.
2. (Original) The pavement tape of claim 1 wherein said rear face comprises an adhesive for bonding said pavement tape to pavement.
3. (Original) The pavement tape of claim 2 further comprising a flexible release tape, one face of which is releasably bonded to said adhesive.
4. (Original) The pavement tape of claim 1 further comprising a flexible protective tape, one face of which is releasably bonded to said front face of said pavement tape.
5. (Original) The pavement tape of claim 1 wherein said at least one symbol conveys commercial information.
6. (Original) The pavement tape of claim 1 wherein said tape is from about 6 to about 12 inches in width.
7. (Original) The pavement tape of claim 1 wherein at least part of said at least one symbol is reflective.
8. (Original) The pavement tape of claim 1 wherein at least part of said front face is reflective.
9. (Previously Presented) A pavement tape for conveying information when affixed to pavement, said pavement tape comprising a continuous elongated flexible tape body comprising front and rear faces, said front face comprising at least one symbol that conveys information, the at least one symbol formed as a perforation extending at least

30 of 34

## APPEAL BRIEF

Submitted in Response to the Final Office Action Dated 08/02/2006 in U.S. Serial No. 10/633,943

PAGE 35/39 \* RCVD AT 8/25/2006 6:25:48 PM [Eastern Daylight Time] \* SVR:USPTO-EFXRF-1/14 \* DNIS:2738300 \* CSID:7209313001 \* DURATION (mm:ss):12:00

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

*Attorney Docket: 408392*

partly from said front face to said rear face of said tape body, wherein the front and rear faces are exposed at an end of the continuous elongated flexible tape body.

10. (Previously Presented) A pavement tape for conveying information when affixed to pavement, said pavement tape comprising:

an elongated flexible tape body comprising front and rear faces, said front face comprising at least one symbol that conveys information; and

a mask tape, said mask tape comprising a flexible mask tape body having front and rear mask faces and at least one symbol formed as a perforation extending from said front mask face to said rear mask face, said rear mask face of said mask tape being bonded to said front face of said pavement tape.

11. (Previously Presented) The pavement tape of claim 1 further comprising at least one railing attachable to the pavement and configured for protecting at least one edge of said pavement tape.

12-27. (Cancelled)

28. (Previously Presented) A pavement tape comprising:

a continuous elongated flexible unitary tape body of homogenous composition, including a front face and a continuously flat rear face;

the rear face configured to be affixed to a durable surface of a road or walkway;

and

the front face bearing at least one symbol that conveys information to persons traveling over the road or walkway, wherein the symbol is printed on the front face.

29. (Previously presented) The pavement tape of claim 28, wherein said rear face comprises an adhesive for bonding said pavement tape to the durable surface of a road or walkway.

30. (Previously presented) The pavement tape of claim 29, further comprising a flexible release tape, one face of which is releasably bonded to said adhesive.

*Attorney Docket: 408392*

31. (Previously presented) The pavement tape of claim 28, further comprising a flexible protective tape, one face of which is releasably bonded to said front face.
32. (Previously presented) The pavement tape of claim 28, wherein said at least one symbol conveys commercial information.
33. (Previously presented) The pavement tape of claim 28, wherein said continuous elongated flexible unitary tape body is from about 6 to about 12 inches in width.
34. (Previously presented) The pavement tape of claim 28, wherein one or more of at least part of said at least one symbol and said front face is reflective.
35. (Cancelled)

*Atty. Docket No. 408392*

**EVIDENCE APPENDIX TO APPEAL BRIEF**

No evidence is submitted with this Appeal Brief.

33 of 34

APPEAL BRIEF

Submitted in Response to the Final Office Action Dated 08/02/2006 in U.S. Serial No. 10/633,943

PAGE 38/39 \* RCVD AT 8/25/2006 6:25:48 PM [Eastern Daylight Time] \* SVR:USPTO-EFXRF-1/14 \* DNIS:2738300 \* CSID:7209313001 \* DURATION (mm:ss):12:00

*Atty. Docket No. 408392*

**RELATED PROCEEDINGS APPENDIX TO APPEAL BRIEF**

Appellants are unaware of any related proceedings as identified in 37 C.F.R.  
§§41.37 (c)(1)(ii) or (c)(1)(x).

34 of 34

**APPEAL BRIEF**

Submitted in Response to the Final Office Action Dated 08/02/2006 in U.S. Serial No. 10/633,943

PAGE 39/39 \* RCVD AT 8/25/2006 6:25:48 PM (Eastern Daylight Time) \* SVR:USPTO-EFXRF-1/14 \* DNIS:2738300 \* CSID:7209313001 \* DURATION (mm:ss):12:00

**This Page is Inserted by IFW Indexing and Scanning  
Operations and is not part of the Official Record**

## **BEST AVAILABLE IMAGES**

Defective images within this document are accurate representations of the original documents submitted by the applicant.

Defects in the images include but are not limited to the items checked:

- BLACK BORDERS**
- IMAGE CUT OFF AT TOP, BOTTOM OR SIDES**
- FADED TEXT OR DRAWING**
- BLURRED OR ILLEGIBLE TEXT OR DRAWING**
- SKEWED/SLANTED IMAGES**
- COLOR OR BLACK AND WHITE PHOTOGRAPHS**
- GRAY SCALE DOCUMENTS**
- LINES OR MARKS ON ORIGINAL DOCUMENT**
- REFERENCE(S) OR EXHIBIT(S) SUBMITTED ARE POOR QUALITY**
- OTHER:** \_\_\_\_\_

**IMAGES ARE BEST AVAILABLE COPY.**

**As rescanning these documents will not correct the image problems checked, please do not report these problems to the IFW Image Problem Mailbox.**